

Interview Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	09/431,469		ARMISTEAD ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Marjorie A. Moran		1631	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Marjorie A. Moran.

(3) _____.

(2) Lisa Dixon.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 6/1/01-6/18/01.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 19, 21, 23, 24.

Identification of prior art discussed: None.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

MG Moran
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: In a series of conversations, the examiner told Ms. Dixon that the claims appeared to be free of the prior art but that claims 19 and 21 did not recite statutory subject matter as they are directed solely to computational and analysis (i.e. mental equivalent) steps. The examiner suggested several possible amendments to overcome this problem. In addition, the examiner suggested amendments to claims 23 and 24 to overcome rejections of record. Ms. Dixon stated that claim 23 intended to limit the entire molecular complex of claims 19 and 22, wherein the binding pockets of the complex are also limited as set forth in claims 19 and 22. Ms. Dixon informed the examiner that applicants wanted more time to consider claim amendments and requested that a written office be sent.